

MAR 2 1923

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVI, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1923

WHOLE No. 442



## Columbia University

In the City of New York

### SUMMER SESSION

July 9 to August 17, 1923



Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different Schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., M.D., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

#### GREEK

**Elementary Course** (= Entrance Greek a)  
Professor EUGENE TAVENNER  
**Xenophon** (= Entrance Greek b)  
Professor EUGENE TAVENNER

**Greek Lyric Poets** (College Course)  
Dr. CLINTON W. KEYES  
**Greek Lyric Poets** (Graduate Course)  
Dr. CLINTON W. KEYES

#### LATIN

**Elementary Course** (For Beginners)  
Mr. IRVING C. DEMAREST  
**Caesar, Gallic War** (= Entrance Latin 3)  
Dr. CLINTON W. KEYES  
**Vergil, Aeneid I-VI** (= Entrance Latin 5)  
Mr. IRVING C. DEMAREST  
**Cicero** (= Entrance Latin 4)  
Dr. JOHN E. BARSS  
**Prose Composition** (= Entrance Latin 6)  
Dr. JOHN E. BARSS  
**Prose Composition** (For Teachers)  
Professor WILLIAM STUART MESSER  
**Prose Composition** (For the A.M. Degree)  
Professor CHARLES KNAPP

**Vergil, Aeneid** (Advanced Course)  
Professor GORDON J. LAING  
**Ovid, Metamorphoses**  
Professor CHARLES KNAPP  
**Roman Oratory**  
Professor GORDON J. LAING  
**The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil**  
Professor WILLIAM STUART MESSER  
**Teaching Latin in Secondary Schools**  
Dr. WREN J. GRINSTEAD  
**Demonstration Class in Beginning Latin**  
Dr. WREN J. GRINSTEAD

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

**Ancient History** (General Course)  
Mr. ROY F. NICHOLS  
**Assyrian Archaeology**  
Dr. FREDERICK A. VANDERBURGH

**The History of Greece**  
Professor DONALD MCFAYDEN  
**The Roman Empire**  
Professor DONALD MCFAYDEN

Three Teachers Wrote this Advertisement

## Elements of Latin

By BENJAMIN L. D'OOGÉ

*Let them tell you what they think about the book:*

I have found it to be admirably fitted as a text-book for beginners, as it seems to explain the fundamentals more clearly than any book with which I am familiar. I have used it with great success and would unhesitatingly recommend it to any group of pupils<sup>1</sup>.

We are finding the arrangement to be of the greatest value as it allows concentration on the simplest grammatical principles. Clearness, directness, and a natural sequence in order characterize every page<sup>2</sup>.

I find it interesting, logical, attractive in presentation, and economical in point of time. It is a book for which we have been looking<sup>3</sup>.

The Teachers are

1. GEORGE W. DAVENPORT, JR., *Tome School, Port Deposit, Md.*
2. ANNIE DUNSTER, *William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia.*
3. MARY C. BURCHINAL, *West Philadelphia High School for Girls.*

**GINN AND COMPANY**

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

## Takes the Drudgery out of Second Year Latin

**T**HERE is no "dull grind" in the study of Caesar with **Place's Second Year Latin**. This book shows a rare understanding of the psychology of young people. By at once arousing their interest and then focusing that interest through a unique, systematic plan for overcoming difficulties, it gives the pupil real efficiency. And efficiency brings a desire for progress. Pupils like to do what they can do well.

The work for each day is systematically blocked out for the teacher, whose task is thus greatly lightened. The definite lessons under the principle of "one thing at a time" make it easy for the teacher to measure the pupil's ability and progress.

*Reading Caesar Becomes a Pleasure  
with Place's Second Year Latin*

**SECOND YEAR LATIN**

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt. D.

Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

584 pages

4 full pages in color

10 colored maps

Richly illustrated also in black-and-white

Price, \$1.68

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVI, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1923

WHOLE No. 442

## PROFESSOR BRIGGS ON CERTAIN TESTS IN FIRST TERM LATIN

Elsewhere in this issue appears an article entitled *An Examination in First Term Latin*, by Dr. Thomas H. Briggs, Professor of Education in Teachers College, Columbia University. This gives the results of an experimental study conducted, during the School year 1921-1922, at the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, New York, "to ascertain to what extent it is possible to foretell the ability to learn Latin". The study was conducted, with the cooperation of the Latin teachers of the School, by Mr. William S. Allen, under the direction and supervision, I believe, of Professor Briggs. Mr. Allen took his Doctor's Degree in Teachers College last June, and is Professor of Education at Baylor University, Waco, Texas. I think that his dissertation, to be published soon by the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, will deal with his study at the Boys' High School.

Professor Briggs has been distinctly temperate and courteous throughout, but, as a teacher of Latin, who has had some experience in teaching in the School, as well as in the College and in the University, I find myself unable to accept, in toto, his statements concerning the tests about which he writes.

In his initial paragraph, he states that, inasmuch as the 364 pupils involved were instructed by four different teachers, it was judged unsatisfactory to use the term mark, or to depend wholly upon the results of the final examination, "the former of necessity varying with the individual teacher, and the latter being inadequate in scope". I can readily understand why, to any one dealing with statistics, any latitude of individual judgment, even the slightest, should be appalling. But, if we assume, for the sake of argument, that it would be possible to set an examination in which every word written by the candidate could receive a definite and invariable value, I should say that the outcome would be unfortunate, in that the chief result would be to create mechanical standardization, a sorry substitute for individualism. To me, such a result is as appalling as the latitude of individual judgment is to the statistician. But I am yet far from being convinced that it would be possible to set tests of such a sort that every word written by the candidate could be so valued that, no matter how many different persons were to mark the papers, they would all mark the same paper in exactly the same way.

Professor Briggs describes the final examination set in the Boys' High School, in June, 1921, and printed by him, in full, at the close of his paper, as "inadequate in scope". He elaborates this declaration in paragraph (3). A teacher of Latin could argue, successfully,

I think, that there is not a single point, except punctuation, covered by the Tests set by Professor Briggs that is not covered by the Boys' High School examination paper. If I am at all right in what I say below about Professor Briggs's test in pronunciation, the Boys' High School teachers were wise in omitting pronunciation from their paper.

In paragraph (1), Professor Briggs declares that <all> the directions in his Tests are easily understood by the pupils. This I doubt. He thinks that practice exercises should have been offered to the pupils. With this I agree. An unfamiliar type of test is likely to be confusing to pupils, with consequent impairment of the results obtained or obtainable through the test.

In paragraph (2), Professor Briggs states that "The responses by pupils may be easily and quickly recorded". He means, I suppose, that the pupils may easily and quickly <and safely, rightly> set down their answers to the questions in the Tests. On this point, there may well be doubts. As I looked over the papers, as they appeared in Professor Briggs's original manuscript (for lack of space, they had to be printed in condensed—and so less clear—form in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*), it seemed to me that it would be quite easy for a pupil to make a mistake by aberration of the eye into the wrong line or wrong column, and so to appear more stupid, or ignorant, than he really was. I have no doubt also that the scorers would find it difficult to keep the lines separate. But, leaving these mechanical matters aside, I would say that I am not yet ready to approve examinations so constructed that the pupil need not "do anything except make a vertical line", etc. Nor do I like much better such a test as Test VIII, Construction, where the answer is to take the form of a single word. On this latter point, something more will be said below.

According to paragraph (5), Professor Briggs evidently regards it as desirable that tests should be so arranged that "every pupil can answer some <items> correctly and no pupil can make a perfect score". I do not think it fair to set before a pupil on an examination a question to which he cannot be expected to give an answer, no matter how good a student he is of the subject, no matter how well he is endowed by nature with ability to pursue the subject, and no matter how faithfully he has done his work. If a test is a fair one for the major part of a class—the average pupil—, there may very well be, in a large class, one, or two, three, or even more, students who can make on it a perfect score. Professor Briggs seems to make no allowance whatsoever for the students—and, dis

gratias, such there are—that are far above the average of a class. Nor am I at all sure that it would be possible so to arrange tests for first term Latin students that there would be always on a test one question which every pupil could answer. Here, it seems to me, no allowance was made by Professor Briggs for the distinctly subnormal student, the student much below the average—the very student that, as I understand it, ‘prognostic’ tests, such as Mr. Allen, under Professor Briggs’s direction, was setting, are meant primarily to discover—the student who, because of temperamental and intellectual inability to grasp a subject, ought not to be allowed to waste, by pursuit of a subject, his own time, the time of his fellow-students, and the time of teachers.

In paragraph (6), Professor Briggs declares that his tests are diagnostic (prognostic). I fail to see wherein they are different from any sensibly made tests of the so-called ‘ordinary’ type. The object of Professor Briggs’s Tests was to foretell the ability of pupils to learn Latin. They were applied to pupils in the Boys’ High School after the pupils had been actually studying Latin, it would appear, for one term. Evidently, in this particular instance, the foretelling of the pupils’ ability to learn Latin was based entirely upon the success of those pupils, or their failure, to learn the forms and the principles which they had studied during that first term. Surely, the ‘ordinary’ tests are given at like times and under virtually identical conditions, not merely to make sure whether the pupil has—or has not—been learning the forms and the principles which he has been studying, but also, in part, to determine whether the pupil is or is not fitted to go on with the work of the next term. Every capable teacher of Latin has known, through the ‘ordinary’ tests, who were fitted, and who were not, to pursue Latin further with profit. It follows, therefore, that every examination ever set in a Latin class has been ‘diagnostic’, and ‘prognostic’. The only difference, so far as I can see, between the thousands of tests that have been set in Latin class-rooms, year after year, and Professor Briggs’s Tests, is the fact that no Latin teacher ever called them diagnostic or prognostic.

I make now some detailed comments on the Tests. At first, I wondered why, in Test I, on Syllabification, Accent, a monosyllable was included in each half. How, I asked myself, can any one divide *urbs* and *pars* into syllables? It seemed to me something like a ‘catch’, and with that sort of thing I have no patience.

However, one very excellent teacher of Latin, before whom I laid my doubts, declared that the inclusion of monosyllables in such a test was entirely legitimate: “if the pupil understands the principles of syllabification, he will write *urbs* |”. Another excellent teacher of Latin declared that, in a polyglot community, such as Greater New York, the inclusion of *urbs* and *pars* is entirely legitimate, as a means of testing the real knowledge of the pupil; boys (and girls) in Greater New York, and doubtless in other cities, often, if not habitually, insert an epenthetic vowel between consonants, that is, they say *gol-if*, *gym-i-nasium*. The

same teacher tells me that this habit seriously interferes, sometimes, with ability to scan Latin verse.

In connection with Test VI, Vocabulary, Professor Briggs declares that, from the total list of words appearing in the first thirty-six lessons of the text-book, certain words were chosen, to form the basis of the Test, because these words have “the greatest frequency in Professor Lodge’s list”. Now, ever since Professor Lodge’s admirable study, *The Vocabulary of High School Latin*, appeared, makers of elementary Latin text-books of all sorts have, in large measure, based their vocabularies upon that work. In this they have, in my judgment, done well. But, after all, assuming that the text-book to which Professor Briggs referred did, in fact, base its vocabulary on Professor Lodge’s list, would it not have been fairer to base Test VI on the nouns, the verbs, the adjectives, and the adverbs, used most often, and emphasized most, in the beginners’ book itself? Unless those nouns, verbs, etc., of the text-book happened to be identical, throughout, with the words of “greatest frequency in Professor Lodge’s list”, and had been duly emphasized in the text-book, the pupils who underwent Test VI were handicapped.

Professor Briggs himself admits that Test VII, Derivation, was too difficult. I suspect that he accepts the doctrine that Latin should be taught primarily to increase the student’s control of English. Such increase I regard as a valuable by-product; I do not count it the chief objective of either the study or the teaching of Latin. But, assuming for the sake of argument that Latin should be taught primarily to increase the pupils’ knowledge of English, why set before pupils of 12, 13, or 14 years of age such words as ‘eversible’, ‘propugn’, and ‘ductile’? I once heard of a very precocious child who, at some astonishingly early age (five, I believe), at the dinner table employed in talk with her father and mother (it is said) the word ‘parvanimity’. Personally I should fear for the physical and intellectual existence of the child who could—or would—use such a word. But we have few—if any—children of that sort in the High Schools of New York City. To many pupils in those Schools English is not the vernacular. In criticizing a paper handed in to me, recently, at Barnard College, by a student, I commenced repeatedly on the bad English displayed in the paper. The student explained to me that she does not normally hear English at home at all; she is a Ukrainian, who hears at home regularly five different languages—all Slavonic! A similar story, differing only in degree, would be told by hundreds, if not thousands, of pupils in the High Schools of New York City, and in other polyglot cities of our country; and yet for such pupils words like ‘eversible’ and ‘propugn’ were set.

By far the worst test is Test IX, Pronunciation. Would the pupils to whose presence in our High Schools attention was called in the preceding paragraph pronounce all these words alike? Yet, unless pupils pronounce all the words of a test exactly alike, the value of a pronunciation test is reduced materially, at once, if not completely destroyed.



Again, I notice that the student is asked to tell whether the Latin *miser* (whose penult is short) rhymes most nearly with the English *wiser*, or with English *we sir*, or with English *nicer*, or with English *twizzer*. Every one of these four English words presupposes a long *i* in the penult of the Latin word *miser*. Precisely the same objection lies against the four expressions set opposite the Latin *etiam*. The inadequacy of the four possibilities set opposite Latin *apud* is not so clear, but certainly, in theory at least, no good Latin teacher pronounces the *-ud* of *apud* in any such way as the ordinary person would pronounce the corresponding parts of English *flood*, *feud*, *food*, and *mud*. In a number of instances, then, in this Pronunciation Test everything set down by the tester was wrong; no possibility of a correct answer was afforded by him to the pupil.

Of course the fundamental mistake here is in setting a *written* test on pronunciation. The only fair way of testing a student's knowledge of pronunciation would be to find out how his teacher pronounced the Latin and to test the pupil's pronunciation of Latin by the teacher's pronunciation. And this testing should be done *orally*. This would mean, of course, the setting of a separate test for every section of a first year Latin class in such a School as the Boys' High School in Brooklyn.

I stated above, in general terms, my objection to tests so constructed that a pupil need not do anything except make a vertical line, or answer by a single word. Let us look at Test VIII, Construction. Here, in questions 2, 4, 6, 8 of the Alpha part, and in questions 4, 6, 7, 9 of the Beta part, there was what the pupils themselves would call a 'fifty-fifty' possibility that one who did not really *know* anything about the matters involved might guess correctly about one part of the question—the "With Without" part.

This possibility in itself is a sufficient indictment of this particular form of question. Furthermore, even assuming that, in every case, the answer proceeded from exact knowledge, it is certainly far less important for a student to know that *some* preposition is used in a certain construction than that he should know *what* preposition is used in that construction.

But there is a still more serious objection to Test VIII.

I try very hard to teach my students, undergraduate and graduate both, that the proper *immediate* answer to many a question is "That depends"—sometimes upon the interpretation of the question, sometimes upon the allowances one has to make for external circumstances or possibilities of divers sorts. If I were asked to answer, by a single word, question Alpha 6 of this Construction Test, I should say, with respect to the 'With Without' part, (1) 'That depends', and so (2) 'I cannot answer by a single word'. The true answer depends on the presence or absence of an adjective or a genitive—an external circumstance. No one can give, by a single word, a truthful answer to this question. This is, of course, merely another way of saying that there is no universal answer to this question—no

answer universally true. The situation is precisely similar with respect to Alpha 8, Beta 4, 6, and 7. There are, as every capable teacher of Latin knows, and as many a High School student of Latin knows, in all these matters, modifying factors which make it impossible to answer, truthfully and honorably, by a single word. Certain questions, then, as put in Test VIII, were unscientific and unethical. They erred, too, in that they gave the really intelligent and discriminating pupil no chance to display those qualities.

The standard of Latin teaching—and learning—suggested by this Test is far beneath the standard set before himself or herself by every capable teacher of Latin, and could be satisfactory only to the 'moronic' or distinctly sub-average portion of a Latin class.

Though I can see very distinct advantages, under some circumstances, in tests which set before the student several or multiple possibilities, and require from him therefore two or more responses, I think it would be fairer to set tests of that sort before students at a later stage of their study of Latin than the close of the first term. Horace declared once, in wise words, that *Nihil est ab omni parte beatum*. By way of illustrating this, I should say that, in the making of these tests, Professor Briggs and Mr. Allen, in seeking to gain particular results, disregarded certain advantages of the study of Latin, and deprived the students undergoing the Tests of certain helps which had been part and parcel of their daily study of Latin, if that study had been at all intelligent. Every Beginner's Latin Book at the present time marks quantities, and intelligent teaching and intelligent study of Latin alike make use of these quantities, in the location of forms; in other words, good teachers of Latin insist on careful observation and differentiation of phenomena, an important part of the process of learning, and good pupils profit by such observation. Personally, I should think it rather more desirable for a first-term student to be able to recognize, instantaneously, the fact that *fuga*, with a macron over the *a*, must be an ablative singular than it is for him to know that *ei* could be both dative singular and nominative plural.

The pupil trained to notice quantity-markings might have some difficulty with Test III, Nouns—since the pupils here were directed to look out for dual or multiple possibilities. I wonder whether, in point of fact, the pupil was expected by the Tester to report two possibilities for *fuga* (without quantity-marking)? To a person used to quantity-marks, there would be but one possibility. The same comment could be made upon *pontis* and *fratris*.

If my comments are in any sense justified, it is plain that Professor Briggs's Tests left very much indeed to be desired. We shall never have ideal tests, of course, but we shall never have even good tests, unless tests represent, in larger measure than has been the case heretofore, the matured and combined activities of at least three classes of persons: (1) persons thoroughly versed in Latin, the language and the literature, and at the same time skilful in the teaching of Latin, particularly in the Schools; (2) persons definitely trained

in education, the psychology of education, and kindred subjects; (3) persons who possess at once (a) a knowledge of the Latin language and Latin literature, (b) skill (as the result of experience and natural ability) in the teaching of Latin, and (c) training in education, the psychology of education, and kindred subjects. Our chief lack has been and is the lack of persons who can qualify under the heading (3). As a result, the Latinist has been unwilling to accept the dicta of the educator and the psychologist, on the ground that the latter know little or nothing about the subject-matter of Latin courses, and the educator and the psychologist have been unwilling to accept the dicta of the teachers of Latin, on the ground that the latter know nothing, technically, professionally, scientifically, concerning education. I myself believe that teachers of Latin have been less handicapped by their real or supposed ignorance of education than the professors of education and the psychologists have been handicapped by their real or supposed ignorance of Latin, and of the way in which it has been, and is being, taught, by the really capable teachers of the subject.

One last declaration. I do not want the present or the future of Latin to be determined, in the slightest degree, by the knowledge (or the lack of knowledge), the methods (or lack of methods), the practices (or lack of practices), the desires or ideals (or lack of ideals), of the *average teacher* of Latin, any more than I want the present and the future of Latin to be determined by the capacities and desires of the *average pupil* of Latin, or by the capacities, desires, and ideals of the *average graduate student of education*, or by the capacities, desires, and ideals of the *average educator*, or the *average psychologist*. In the make-up of every average there are vastly more examples of the sub-average than there are of the super-average. An average, therefore, represents in the main the sub-normal. I should hope that the professors of education would be the last persons in the world to desire that the present and the future of education shall be determined by the capacities or incapacities, the desires or aversions, of the sub-average, the sub-normal. To get the best tests—indeed, to get really respectable tests—in any subject, we must have cooperation of the *best* representatives of the three types of persons referred to above. And I might add, as a last thought, that to be the best representative of any one of these classes an individual must have, in addition to his technical equipment, not merely respectable, but really high and noble ideals concerning education and the training of youth.

C. K.

#### AN EXAMINATION IN FIRST TERM LATIN

Recently, in an experimental study conducted by Mr. William Sims Allen to ascertain to what extent it is possible to foretell the ability to learn Latin, it became necessary to measure with a high degree of accuracy the success of pupils after one semester of instruction. Inasmuch as the 364 pupils in the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, were instructed by four different teachers, it was judged unsatisfactory to use the term

marks or to depend wholly upon the results of the final examination, the former of necessity varying with the individual teacher and the latter being inadequate in scope. Consequently the eleven pairs of tests herein presented were constructed. They are believed to have the following merits of good tests.

(1) *The directions are easily understood by the pupils.* In two of the eleven pairs of tests illustrations are given of what is to be done and of the correct method of giving answers. Probably similar illustrations should have been given in the other tests, and perhaps, as several of the types of tests were unfamiliar to the pupils, practice exercises should also have been offered.

(2) *The responses by pupils may be easily and quickly recorded.* They consist of the minimum of writing when the pupils are required to do anything except make a vertical line, a series of crosses, or underscore and cancel. Thus in the ninety minutes for one series pupils may be tested on a fair sampling of the entire number of topics covered.

(3) *The tests are comprehensive.* The thirty-six lessons covered in the text-book used, Collar and Daniell's First Year of Latin, when analyzed, were found to treat of syllabification and accent, pronunciation, gender, the declension of nouns, the declension of pronouns, the partial conjugation of verbs, vocabulary, derivation, construction, translation from Latin into English, and translation from English into Latin. To measure the achievements of pupils in each topic, eleven pairs of tests were devised, each concerned with a liberal number of the more important items. To illustrate the extent to which this series of tests is more comprehensive than the ordinary term examination, to which was allotted the same of amount of time, an excellent examination prepared by Dr. Riess and his colleagues of the Boys' High School, in June, 1921, for similar classes, is appended.

(4) *Each test contains a sufficient number of items to minimize the effect of ignorance of the details required or of accident.* In a short examination the chance selection by the teacher of words to be divided into syllables, accented, or parsed plays too large a part in determining a pupil's mark. A good test should secure enough responses on any topic to make fortune unimportant. The tests were divided into Alpha and Beta halves, judged to be of equal difficulty. The pupils' marks computed on each half separately and compared show that the tests have a high degree of reliability. Those statistically trained will understand the reliability index of .87 when the two series are compared and of .93 when they are pooled (the maximum index is 1.00; the index of two good term examinations such as ordinarily given is not likely to exceed .60).

(5) *The items are so chosen and arranged from easy to difficult that every pupil can answer some correctly and no pupil can make a perfect score.* When there are 'undistributed' zero or maximum scores, the knowledge of some pupils is inadequately measured. This ideal is unfortunately not fully achieved by any of the tests in the two series, in spite of the combined effort of those who were best in a position to estimate the abilities of

the pupils and that of the writer. The tests on derivation were too difficult, 31 and 35 pupils making no score on Alpha and Beta respectively. From one to thirteen zero scores were made on five of the other twenty tests. The Beta test on gender, the Beta test on vocabulary, and the Alpha test on pronouns were far too easy, 101, 100, and 71 pupils respectively making perfect scores. The other tests more nearly satisfied the ideal.

(6) *The tests are diagnostic.* Each test measuring one topic, a teacher may ascertain from the results just wherein and to what extent there is weakness in individual pupils or in the entire class. This information enables him to assign review work and to plan for future instruction economically and efficiently.

(7) *The papers may be quickly scored.* As the pupils are required to do little writing, the teacher can correct the papers with a minimum of eye-strain and labor. The types of response enable one to get in a given time far more information about pupils' knowledge than is possible in reading examinations as ordinarily set. There is no known means, however, of securing the desired information without some labor.

The tests were devised so as to cover every important item in each of the eleven topics in the first thirty-six lessons in the text-book. They were then criticized by the teachers of Latin in the High School, and by their advice divided into halves of approximately equal difficulty, assigned scores weighted for each item, and given amounts of time suitable for securing full responses from the pupils. Fourteen teachers and specialists in Latin then cooperated to determine the percentage that each pair of tests should receive in a pupil's possible total mark. These data are shown in Table I.

Table I

Test	Minutes Allowed	Number of Words	Possible Score	Per- centage Allowed
I. Syllabification, Accent	4	12	34	5
II. Gender	3	10	15	5
III. Nouns	9	15	22	9
IV. Pronouns	9	15	32	9
V. Verbs	15	21	63	16
VI. Vocabulary	6	25	20	10
VII. Derivation	7	10	30	6
VIII. Construction	9	16	27	11
IX. Pronunciation	4	8	14	4
X. Translation: English to Latin	12	30	25	12
XI. Translation: Latin to English	12	32	23	13
Total	90	194	305	100

The eleven pairs of tests, with brief comment, follow.

#### I. SYLLABIFICATION AND ACCENT

Divide the following Latin words into syllables by vertical lines: e. g. de | est.

*Alpha:* dea urbs narro amatur pilum saepe pauci complet convocat publice aedificium confirmo

*Beta:* via pars mitto monetis telum praeda nauta implorat convenit recipe Germania potestas

Accent the fourth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth words.

It may be noted that each word presented illustrates a different phase of the rule for syllabification, and that

the twelve items in Beta are almost an exact parallel to those in Alpha.

#### II. GENDER

Write M, F, or N after each of the following words to indicate its gender.

*Alpha:* fuga cibus liber quid eas nauta donum multitudo mare potestas

*Beta:* terra remus ager illud eos agricola pilum natio caput aestas.

The items call for a knowledge of the different rules of gender. Roughly, the easier words are given first.

#### III. NOUNS

Make a cross (x) in the appropriate columns to indicate the number and the case or cases of each noun. Be sure to mark *all* the cases in which a form may be.

*Alpha:* alarum capitis equitem lapide pontis fuga vulnus servo hominibus collis consilia telum terga libri inopias.

*Beta:* duci anni horas patriam legionum mare centurio amici obsides pila captivorum periculis populum portis fratris

The words, printed in a vertical column, were followed by ten other vertical columns, one for each case of each number, in which the pupils could quickly indicate by a cross the form in which the noun was judged to be. All cases in both numbers are represented; approximately half the words are given in forms that are ambiguous and so require two or more responses.

#### IV. PRONOUNS

Place an M, F, N, or A in the appropriate columns to show that the form of the pronoun is masculine, feminine, neuter, or all three in the case indicated. Write plainly. Note the question marks, which show that some pronouns are interrogative. The first word (ei) is correctly marked as an illustration of what you are to do.

*Alpha:* ei cuius? hac quam illius eum eius illarum illud hae his illi illis illo ea haec quibus.

*Beta:* ei earum illos huic illae cui? eas huius qui is quam? quod quae illa id eis.

This test, arranged like the preceding, secures responses which indicate a pupil's knowledge of the case, number, and gender of each pronoun. Several are given in ambiguous forms, thus requiring multiple response.

#### V. VERBS

Mark a cross (x) in the appropriate columns to indicate the voice, tense, and number of each verb form. The conjugation is indicated after each form except for the verb *esse*.

*Alpha:* ambulat I fugimus III habebit II completur II fugaverant I duxerimus III terrebam II docebuntur II misistis III habent II monebaris II reperit IV dolueritis II reperitis IV rexeris III portaverunt I fueratis complex II incolebatis III capiebas III audient IV regimur III capiebamur III regemur III audiris IV

*Beta:* sum audiveratis IV emebant III fuerimus veniebamur IV tenuistis II erat ceperint III emunt III daris I natavisti I iaciam III eris defenderat III mitemus III cantabatur I convocabo I fuerunt monuerant II laudabimini I narraveramus I audieris IV capior III audiebamur IV capietur III

Like the two preceding tests, this gives a variety of forms to be completely classified. The idea is of course borrowed from Lohr-Latshaw.

#### VI. VOCABULARY

After each Latin word write its meaning in English.

*Alpha:* do video multus factum hostis navis venio



novus ubi finitimus mons equus parvus clarus aeger  
dimitto fortiter mare postulo reperio aeger interim  
contendo paro oppugno

*Beta:* oppidum locus flumen mitto omnis fuga pugna  
auxilium imperium teneo gravis pauci insula porta  
supero duco incolo murus pes potestas proelium volo  
diu inopia sustineo

All the words appearing in the first thirty-six Lessons of the text-book were listed, and from them were chosen the twenty nouns, the fifteen verbs, the ten adjectives, and the five adverbs having the greatest frequency in Professor Lodge's list.

#### VII. DERIVATION

Look over the following vocabulary so as to be sure you know the necessary meaning of each Latin word.

*Alpha:* aurum, aureus, gold, golden; fero, ferens, bear, bearing; figo, fixus, place, placed; verto, versus, turn, turned; duco, ducens, lead, leading; laboro, laborans, work, working.

*Beta:* fluens, flowing; fundo, fusus, pour, pouring; dico, dictum, say, said; duco, ducens, lead, leading; voco, vocans, call, calling.

Draw on your knowledge of Latin and tell as accurately as you can on a separate sheet of paper what each of the following words *ought* to mean because of its derivation and form. The vocabulary above should help you with the first five.

*Alpha:* aureate auriferous transfix eversible adduce elaborate deviate exemption propugn

*Beta:* influence infuse interdict deduce convoke obvious antemural contravene ductile aqueduct

An attempt was made in this test to see if pupils could apply the meaning of Latin words as given and of others as known, with suffixes which had been taught, to English words more or less unusual to them. An exact etymological definition was scored higher than one better in popular usage. 'A stretching toward' would be considered a better definition of *attention* than 'act of heeding'.

#### VIII. CONSTRUCTION

I. Fill in each blank with one word only so that the completed sentence is correct; where necessary cross out WITH or WITHOUT.

- Alpha*
- The subject of a verb is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Means is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
  - A predicate noun is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Time when is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
  - An indirect object is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Manner is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
  - An adjective modifying a noun in the accusative case is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Place where is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
  - An appositive to a noun in the dative case is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - A verb agrees with its subject in \_\_\_\_\_ and in \_\_\_\_\_.

- Beta*
- The direct object of a verb is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Cause is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, when no preposition is used.
  - A predicate adjective is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Place to which is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
  - A word denoting the owner is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
  - Place from which is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.

- Accompaniment is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
- An appositive to a noun in the genitive case is in the \_\_\_\_\_ case.
- Agent is expressed by the \_\_\_\_\_ case, WITH WITHOUT a preposition.
- An adjective agrees with its noun in \_\_\_\_\_ and case.

#### II. DIRECTIONS

After each of the following sentences write what the underscored phrase expresses (e. g. accompaniment, agent, cause, manner, means, place where or to or from which, separation, or time); and draw a line through the Yes or No leaving the word which tells if a preposition must be used.

- Alpha*
- Soldiers are trained by campaigns. Yes No
  - The Romans fought with intelligence. Yes No
  - They marched from Corinth. Yes No
  - Caesar spent the winter with his soldiers. Yes No
  - She trembled with fear. Yes No
  - The ship sailed to a rocky shore. Yes No

- Beta*
- At dawn he deserted. Yes No
  - The girl lived in a hut. Yes No
  - They next went to Carthage. Yes No
  - She came from a mountain. Yes No
  - He was captured by a guard. Yes No
  - She sang with beautiful expression. Yes No

This test covers nearly all of the constructions studied, requires a minimum of writing, and is easily scored.

#### IX. PRONUNCIATION

Underscore what most nearly rhymes with each of the Latin words in the first column.

<i>Alpha</i>				
1. se	see	tzay	zee	say
2. apud	flood	feud	food	mud
3. cui	cue-ee	cue-eye	kwee	koo-ee
4. pilum	pile oom	peel loom	pea loom	pill um
5. urbs	usurps	suburbs	chirps	verbs
6. miser	wiser	we sir	nicer	twice-er
7. etiam	ate a ham	eighty am	meaty yam	weighty alm
8. portare	poor tar-y	pour tar-y	pour tarry	poor tarr

<i>Beta</i>			
1. diu	lieu	do	see-oo
2. proel (ium)	cool	steal	broil
3. domus	home us	from us	down us
4. vel	well	vell	veil
5. aeger	tiger	vaguer	Elijah
6. iam	I am	yam	calm
7. bellum	bell oom	bell yume	bell loom
8. Thebae	Thebe eye	the eye	they eye

#### X. TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH INTO LATIN

Translate into Latin (for your aid a vocabulary is inserted in parentheses):

*Alpha*

That (ille, illa, illud) night (nox, noctis, f.) Caesar and his (is, ea, id) son (filius, fili), whose reputation (fama) the Romans had long (diu) known (cognosco, cognoscere, cognovi) sent their (suus, -a, -um) nearest (proximus, -a, -um) neighbor (finitima, -ae, f.), Julia's aunt, (amita, -ae) a book (liber, libri) from the camp, because they were friendly (amicus, -a, -um) to her (is, ea, id).

*Beta*

Because Brutus sent (mitto, mittere, misi) from the camp (castra, -orum, n.) a long (longus, -a, -um) letter (litterae, -arum, f.) to his (suus, -a, -um) friends (amicus, -i, m.), the sailors (nauta, -ae, m.), Galba's messengers (nuntius, -i, m.), whose (qui, quae, quod) horses at that (ille, illa, illud) time (tempus, -oris, n.) had been (sum, esse, fui) tired (defessus, -a, -um), were near (proximus, -a, -um) to failure (damnum, -i, n.).

In order that this might be a test of translation rather



than of vocabulary knowledge, the Latin equivalent of nearly every word was given. In one compact sentence the maximum number of constructions is included.

# XI. TRANSLATION FROM LATIN INTO ENGLISH

## Alpha

1. Italia est terra Romanorum.
2. In ea terra magna et lata flumina erant.
3. Quis equites fortis virtute non amat?
4. Eo anno frumentum in agris non videbatur.
5. Roma, quae est urbs Italiae, Genavam (Geneva) veneramus.

## Beta

1. Servi equum Corneliae ducunt.
2. In illo oppido multa et alta aedificia sunt.
3. Quem militem imperator diligentia laudat?
4. Hac aestate hostes ante oppidum non videbuntur.
5. E nostra urbe, quae in insula est, Troiam (Troy) contendimus.

These sentences were furnished by the Latin teachers as representative of the work that was required of the pupils in class. It is in every respect similar to question III in the regular term examination which follows.

# BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATION JUNE 1921 LATIN I 90 MINUTES

DIRECTIONS: Write LEGIBLY; use BOTH sides of paper; keep margin at LEFT; head paper properly. Neatness, spelling and punctuation will be considered in marking.

I. VOCABULARY TEST. Write, on separate sheet, numbers and answers only. TEN MINUTES.

- |             |                |                 |                   |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1. soror    | 6. potestas    | 11. bravely     | 16. heavy         |
| 2. vulnus   | 7. manus       | 12. lack (noun) | 17. attack (verb) |
| 3. ante     | 8. reliquus    | 13. without     | 18. sleep         |
| 4. factum   | 9. civitas     | 14. few         | 19. camp          |
| 5. communis | 10. interficio | 15. save        | 20. time. (10)    |

II. Divide into syllables and accent: (1) diligenter; (2) magna; (3) necessarius. Write the rule governing the accent in (1) and (2). (5)

III. Translate into English: (1) Bellum quod Caesar eo tempore gerebat erat longum. (2) Postea illi cives cibo frumentoque carebunt. (3) Principes quos armaverant ad colloquium venerunt. (4) Equites autem omnes Corintho Romam fugiunt. (5) Galli iter brevissimum ea aestate fecerunt. (16)

IV. Write (a) the case, (b) the reason for the case, for each of the following words taken from passage III: tempore (sentence 1); cibo (sentence 2); quos (sentence 3); Romam (sentence 4); iter (sentence 5). (5)

V. Write a synopsis of AUDIO in 3rd plu. indic. act. of MONEO in 3rd sing. indic. pass. (9)

VI. Translate into Latin: (1) Many towns have been seized by the Romans. (2) He will find his own brother in the camp. (3) The lieutenant sent these soldiers across the river. (4) The general's power was great because of the victory. (5) The woman whom you see is the mother of Cornelia. (15)

VII. Write in Latin in the singular: (1) genitive of EA NOX; (2) accusative of BREVE CORPUS; (3) ablative of FORTIS HOMO; (4) ablative of MAGNUM MARE; (5) dative of HAEC VIRTUS.

Write in Latin in the plural: (1) genitive of RELIQUUS LACUS; (2) genitive of MISERA URBS; (3) dative of QUAE CASTRA; (4) accusative of ILLE COLLIS; (5) ablative of MISER PATER. (20)

VIII. Translate: (1) they are ruled (6) habitus sum (2) you will give (7) vincemini (sing.) (3) I have heard (8) fuistis

(4) we shall have

been seen (9) mittitur

(5) he was taking (10) defensa erat. (10)

IX. Compare in the masculine gender only: fortis, forte. (2)

X. Decline the pronoun EGO in the singular, the pronoun TU in the plural. (4)

XI. Translate CONVOCO and EXSPECTO, and give the meanings of the prefixes. (2)

XIII. Give TWO English derivatives of each of the following: (1) capio; (2) do. (2)

These examinations are published as illustrative of types of analytic testing more nearly approaching the ideals presented above than those usually submitted to pupils. They may be variously modified by teachers for special needs and for other text-books. It is hoped that at least in some details they will prove suggestive and helpful to teachers of elementary Latin.

TEACHERS COLLEGE

THOMAS H. BRIGGS

# MR. FRANKLIN AND THE ORIGIN OF ENGLISH WORDS

Professor Knapp properly asks (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.113) why Webster's Collegiate Dictionary was used as Mr. Franklin's "final authority in locating the sources of the words". My question is, why was not the Oxford Dictionary used for this purpose? How could any one undertake such a study as Mr. Franklin's while ignorant of that monumental work—A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles? It is amazing that the Century Dictionary should be mentioned <by Professor Knapp, even by implication> in these columns as "the best available authority" in its field.

I feel, too, that Mr. Franklin's attention should be drawn to a few books like Jespersen, Growth and Structure of the English Language, Bradley, The Making of English, and Greenough and Kittredge, Words and their Ways in English Speech (for example, Chapter 3, Learned Words and Popular Words).

It is to be feared that statistical writers will get nowhere in English without some historical knowledge of their own. How can a student of the language use such a category as "Anglo-Saxon (including Middle English)"? One must recognize the natural divisions of Old, Middle, and Modern English, and at the same time must realize that the study of Latin has been a formative influence, continuously, in all three periods. "Anglo-Saxon", in the sense of Old English, is a misnomer. The Angles naturally, the Saxons certainly, and doubtless the Jutes, Frisians, etc., who brought the language from Continental Anglia and adjacent parts to England, called the language *Englisc*; see Green, A Short History of the English People, Chapter I, and Sievers-Cook, An Old English Grammar, Editor's Preface.

I fancy, however, with all due respect to Professor Knapp, that an estimate of 5,000 words or more as at least the potential vocabulary of a pupil entering the Junior High School is not excessive. Jespersen (Growth and Structure of the English Language,

Chapter 9) has some interesting remarks bearing on this point<sup>1</sup>:

... Max Müller says that a farm-laborer uses only 300 words, and Wood that 'the average man uses about five hundred words'. But both figures are obviously wrong. ... Mrs. Winfield S. Hall's boy used in his 17th month 232 different words, and when six years old, 2688 words. ... Sweet ... contradicts the statement about 300 words, saying: 'When we find a missionary in Tierra del Fuego compiling a dictionary of 30,000 words in the Yaagan language. ... we cannot give any credence to this statement'. ... Smedberg, who has investigated the vocabulary of Swedish peasants, and who emphasizes its richness in technical terms, arrives at the result that 26,000 is probably too small a figure.

Jespersen continues:

... These statements are easily reconciled with the ascription of 20,000 words to Shakespeare; for it must be remembered that in the case of each of us there is a great difference between the words *known* (especially those of which he has a reading knowledge) and the words actually *used* in conversation. And then there must always be a great many words which a man will use readily in conversation, but which will never occur in his writings. ... If Milton as a poet used only 8,000 against Shakespeare's 20,000 words, this is a natural consequence of the narrower range of his subjects, and it is easy to prove that his vocabulary really contained many more than the 8,000 words found in a Concordance to his poetical works. We have only to take any page of his prose writings, and we shall meet with a great many words not in the Concordance.

As my forthcoming Concordance of Milton's Latin poems will show, his poetical vocabulary in another language is also rich—not to speak of his command of Latin prose; and there are interesting relations, both similarities and differences, between his Latin diction and his English diction. I may add that for various reasons it is hard to compare the size of one poet's vocabulary with the size of another's. Shakespeare's has been put as high as 24,000, and as low as 15,000—never so low as Professor Knapp imagines; Milton's, in his English verse, as high as 15,000. I venture to say that, when the forthcoming Concordance to Browning, by Professors Broughton and Stelter, is all in print, Browning will be found to have used the largest number of different English words in any single modern poet.

<sup>1</sup>Dr. E. H. Sturtevant writes me that Professor Jespersen has an interesting paragraph on the size of the vocabulary of children and ignorant persons, in another of his books, *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin*, 126 (New York, Henry Holt, 1922).

It would be easy to construct a lengthy bibliography of articles discussing the size of the vocabulary of various writers, of children, adults, etc. Thus, to go no further afield than the Transactions and the Proceedings of the American Philological Association, one can find at least the following: F. A. March, *Studies in the vocabularies of the English Poets*, Proceedings 21 (1900), xxx-xxxii, and *The Fluency of Shakespeare*, Transactions 26 (1905), 147-154; Edward S. Holden, *On the vocabularies of Children Under Two Years of Age*, Transactions 8 (1877), 58-68; *idem*, *The Number of Words Used in Speaking and Writing English*, *ibidem* 6 (this last article I have not seen, but it was evidently a discussion by Mr. Holden of his own vocabulary; see below). I name these articles from a single source, "lest we forget"; what is published in the Transactions or the Proceedings of a learned society seems flung to the winds or written on the sands. Mr. Holden refers to a discussion of his own vocabulary which was published in the Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington (1875), Appendix 6. I must not fail to mention here E. L. Thorndike, *Word Knowledge in the Elementary School*, Teachers College Records 22, (1921), 334-370.

C. K.

I recommend the study of such works to all who are looking for 'teachers' word-books'. The poets, ancient and modern, are the best teachers of diction.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

LANE COOPER

### MR. FRANKLIN AGAIN

When I put together my remarks on Mr. Franklin's study (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16. 113-114), I had forgotten that Mr. Franklin had published on the study a brief note, in *School and Society* 15.622-623 (June 3, 1922). I overlooked also the fact that, in *School and Society* 16. 559-560 (November 11, 1922), Mr. Jacob S. Orleans, of Teachers College, discussed Mr. Franklin's paper, under the title, *Possible Transfer Value of the Study of Latin to English Vocabulary*. It would be impossible to do justice to Mr. Orleans's article without reprinting it in full; to judge it one ought to have before him the Tables and their explanations. Mr. Orleans questioned Mr. Franklin's methods and his results.

I have space barely to refer to two other points—very important points, made to me in private conversation by Professor Lodge. In Professor Thorndike's book, *The Teachers' Word Book*, *a* and *an* are listed as separate words. So are *are*, *aren't*, *was*, *were*, *we're*, *weren't*, *wasn't*; *has*, *have*, *had*, *hadn't*, *hasn't*, *haven't*; *he*, *she*, *he's*, *him*, *his*; *she*, *her*, *hers*, etc., etc. On pages 127-134 of the Word Book there is "a list of the 2500 words of most wide and frequent occurrence, arranged in five sets of 500 each". Among the first 500 words occur the following: *a*, *an*; *are*, *be*, *been*, *was*, *were*; *did*, *do*, *does*, *done*; *gave*; *give*, *given*; *had*, *has*, *have*; *he*, *she*, *her*, *him*, *himself*, *his*, *their*, *them*, *they*; *I*, *me*, *mine*, *my*, *we*; *saw*, *see*, *seen*; *you*, *your*; etc. The forms of a verb certainly ought not to be counted as separate and distinct words. Why should the forms of the personal pronouns be counted as so many separate words? If one were to go through Professor Thorndike's Word Lists in this way, and combine under a single word-caption all the forms of that word which the student, if he is taught English at all, ought to be taught to group together, the Word Lists in their final form would present a very different appearance, and the percentage of Latin words in the Lists would be greatly increased.

The second point made to me by Professor Lodge has been illustrated in part by what was said in the foregoing paragraph. It is that in Professor Thorndike's Word List, as in every similar list, the words of greatest frequency are, inevitably, little words like the 'indefinite article', the 'definite article', the prepositions and conjunctions (many of them of 'Anglo-Saxon' origin), that have no significant value of their own, that is, they are words which, if set down alone on a printed or a written page, have no meaning. As a child might say, you can't *do* anything with such words. So soon as we begin to reach words, such as nouns, and verbs, and to a less extent adjectives, that have significant values in and of themselves, the Latin element begins to appear.

C. K.